1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 7 8 9 WILLIE LAMAR HARTWELL, 10 Petitioner, Case No. 2:07-CV-01371-KJD-(LRL) 11 VS. **ORDER** D. W. NEVEN, et al., 12 Respondents. 13 14 15 Before the court are petitioner's motion for reconsideration (#33) and motion to alter or amend amended order (#34). Respondents have filed an opposition (#35). 16 17 Petitioner expresses dissatisfaction with the court's denial of his amended petition 18 for a writ of habeas corpus (#18). His contentions are more appropriate for appellate review than a 19 motion for reconsideration. See McCarthy v. Mayo, 827 F.2d 1310, 1318 (9th Cir. 1987). See also Plotkin v. Pacific Tel. and Tel. Co., 688 F.2d 1291, 1293 (9th Cir. 1982). 20 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion for reconsideration (#33) 21 and motion to alter or amend amended order (#34) are **DENIED**. 22 DATED: October 2, 2010 23 24 25 KENT J. DAWSON United States District Judge 26 27

28